



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/991,855	12/16/1997	TAKAHIRO KII	1083.1046/JD	3105

21171 7590 05/16/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten signature

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/991,855

Applicant(s)

KII ET AL.

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 9, 13, and 17: The added limitations of outputting the message with the data for a reply to the message, is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 14-16, and 18-20: Claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because they depend on rejected claims 1, 7, 9, 13, and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2624

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peter et al. (U.S. Patent # 5893098) and Pinter (U.S. Patent # 5894506)

Regarding claim 1: Peter teaches an electronic news system (fig. 13) managing electronic messages (see the question of options that best describes a vehicle of fig. 6) and a reply, (see fig. 6 and see abstract) to the message comprising: storage means (# 102 of fig. 13, fig. 6, bulletin board of column 3 line 5-15, and column 37 line 59-65) for storing data for a fixed form reply; output means (the program that controls the transmitting of survey document, column 8, lines 35-45) for outputting the message with the data for a reply to the message (survey document e.g. fig. 8), the data for a reply independent of the message; (e.g. fig. 8); and control means (2 of fig. 1, abstract) for accepting only a selection out of an outputted data for a reply (see column 8 line 48-55)

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column

Art Unit: 2624

1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

Regarding claim 2: Peter teaches a fixed form reply managing means (collation mean, column 8, lines 63) for managing a plurality of replies by data for respectively specifying the plurality of replies, (the survey document and its data, column 8 line 63-68, column 9 line 1-19) and totaling means (adding, column 4, lines 25-27, of the reply data is equivalent to the teaching of using a totaling means in Peter's system because the function of a totaling mean is to add, and Peter would need a totaling means for performing the addition) for totaling a number of the

Art Unit: 2624

selection of each of fixed form replies as the reply to the message, and storing results of the totalization of each of fixed form replies to the message in relation to said specifying data. (graphic plot with added and manipulated data, column 4 line 25-27).

Regarding claim 3 and 4: Peter teaches the control means has means for accepting an input of a free form reply by the respondent user in reply to the survey message, (See column 8 line 48-57), and managing the inputted free form reply in relation to data to specify the message. (Managing free form reply data associated with the message (fig. 6) by constructing a data base for it, Column 8, lines 48-57).

Regarding claim 6: Peter teaches wherein the control means includes means for causing the output means to output data for a fixed form reply of the kind which fits contents of the message. (See a respondent for producing a response document with replies which fits contents of the message, and automatically transmit (causing the output means to output data) the reply back to a collation mean, column 8, lines 39-55).

Regarding claim 7: Peter et al teaches an electronic news system (fig. 1 and fig. 13) including a client apparatus (# 7 of fig.1) and a server apparatus (# 1, 2 of fig.1) which manages an electronic message (see the question of options that best describes a vehicle of fig. 6) and a reply to the message transmitted from the client apparatus (see abstract) the client apparatus comprising: storage mean (fig. 6, bulletin board of column 3 line 5-15, and column 37 line 59-65) for storing data for a fix form reply (see column 8 line 55-57), output means (the program that controls the transmitting of survey document, column 8, lines 35-45) for outputting the message

Art Unit: 2624

with the data for a reply to the message, (e.g. fig. 8), the data for reply independent of the message; a control mean (see processing apparatus of column 12 line 10) for accepting only a selection out of an outputted data for a reply to the message (see fig. 6, and column 8 line 48-55); and a communication control means (the output means used to output the response document, column 8, line 53) for transmitting the selection to the server apparatus.

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column 1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and

Art Unit: 2624

altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

Regarding claim 8: Peter teaches means for accepting an input of a free form reply to the message reply in the control means (see column 8 line 51-52, and fig. 6), and the server apparatus comprises free form reply managing means for managing the free form reply (see 102 and collator of fig. 13) transmitted from the client apparatus in relation to data for specifying the message. (See the reply associated with the message from the client in the server by loading the data base with replies, such that the replies associate with the message are all conveniently presented in the database, column 8 line 54-59, and column 4 line 24-27).

Regarding claim 9: Peter teaches an electronic news system (fig. 1, fig. 13) having a client (8 of fig. 1) and a server apparatus (1 of fig. 1) which manages electronic messages (response document of column 8 line 53) transmitted from the client, (see abstract, column 8 line 45-59, column 4 line 24-27) the server apparatus comprising: storage mean (fig. 6, bulletin board of column 3 line 5-15, and column 37 line 59-65) for storing data for a fixed form reply, and a communication control means for transmitting data for a reply to the client apparatus; (See column 2 line 62, fig. 6); the client apparatus comprising: a receiving control means (column 12 line 10, the processor used to control receiving of data) for receiving data for a reply sent from

Art Unit: 2624

the server apparatus, (see column 8 line 45-46), the data for a reply independent of the electronic message, (e.g. fig. 8); output means (the processor, column 12, line 10, used to control outputting of data) for outputting the message with the received data for a reply in a screen (e.g. fig. 6) and; a control means (column 8 line 50) for accepting only the selection (e.g. fig. 6) out of the outputted data for a reply (see column 8 line 48-55) as a reply to the message, and transmission control means (the control used to transmit the response, column 8, line 53) for controlling the transmission for transmitting the selected reply (document) to the server apparatus. (See column 8 line 50-55, 2, fig. 1, abstract)

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column 1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

Art Unit: 2624

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

Regarding claim 10: Peter teaches wherein the client apparatus comprises fixed form reply managing means (column 8 line 50) for managing a plurality of fixed form replies by data for respectively specifying the plurality of replies (response) (see column 8 line 50-68, fig. 6), and communication control means, (control program of the processor used to control data transmission, column 8, lines 53) for transmitting specifying data of the selected reply to the server apparatus as a reply, (See column 8 line 50-67), and the server apparatus comprises communication control means (control used to controlling data receiving, column 3, lines 35-40) for receiving the specifying data transmitted from the client apparatus as a reply, (see column 3 line 35-40), and totaling means (adding, column 4, lines 25-27, of the reply data is equivalent to the teaching of using a totaling means in Peter's system because the function of a totaling mean is to add, and Peter would need a totaling means for performing the addition) for totaling a number

Art Unit: 2624

of the selection of each reply as the reply to the message based on the specifying data, and storing the results of the totalization of each reply to the message in relation the specifying data. (graphic plot with added and manipulated data, column 4 line 25-27).

Regarding claims 11 and 12: Peter teaches wherein the client apparatus comprises means for accepting an input of a free form reply to the message in a control means (see column 8 line 51-52, and fig. 6); and the server apparatus comprises free form reply managing means for managing free form reply (see 102 and collator of fig. 13, column 8 line 60-68) transmitted from the client apparatus in relation to the data for specifying the message. (column 8 line 54-68, and column 4 line 24-27).

Regarding claim 13: Peter teaches an electronic news system (fig. 1, fig. 13) including a client (8 of fig. 1) apparatus and a server apparatus (1 of fig. 1) which manages an electronic message and a reply to the message (response document of column 8 line 53) transmitted from the client apparatus, (see abstract, column 8 line 45-59, column 4 line 24-27) the server apparatus comprising: storage mean (fig. 6, bulletin board of column 3 line 5-15, and column 37 line 59-65) for storing data for a first fixed form reply, the messages are independent from the fixed form reply; (e.g. fig. 8) and a communication control means for transmitting the data for the first fixed form reply to the client apparatus; (See column 2 line 62, fig. 6); the client apparatus comprising: a receiving control means (column 12 line 10, the processor used to control receiving of data) for receiving the first data for the first fixed form reply sent from the server apparatus, (see column 8 line 45-46), storing means (the storage in the client that is used to store the E-mail, column 3,

Art Unit: 2624

lines 5-30, column 4, lines 25-50) for storing data for second fixed form reply, (two fixed form reply, column 4, lines 25-48), output means (the processor, column 12, line 10, used to control outputting of data) for outputting the message with the data for the first or second fixed form reply in a screen (e.g. fig. 6, fig. 8) and; control means (column 8 line 50) for accepting only a selection (fig.6) out of the outputted data for the first fixed form reply (see column 8 line 48-55) based on the category (the category of person that like chocolate, column 4, lines 35-50) of the message as the reply to the message, and means for controlling transmission (the control used to transmit the response, column 8, line 53) for transmitting the selected reply (document) out of the data for the first or second fixed form reply to the server apparatus. (See column 8 line 50-55, 2, fig. 1, abstract).

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column 1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Art Unit: 2624

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

Regarding claim 14: Peter teaches that the server apparatus comprises: fixed form reply managing means (2 of column 12 line 5-6) for managing a plurality of first fixed form replies (fig. 6, and fig. 8) with data for respectively specifying (see the specifying reply data of fig. 6, fig. 8) the replies, and means (column 3 line 5-17) for transmitting the specifying data of the first fixed form reply to the client apparatus along with the reply. The client apparatus comprises: fixed form reply managing means (see respondent control means of column 8 line 49-50) for managing a plurality of second fixed form replies (fig. 8) with the data for respectively specifying said replies, (column 8 line 45-68) and means (2 of column 12 line 5-6, abstract) for causing the transmission

Art Unit: 2624

controlling means to transmit the selected second reply or the selected specifying data of the first reply to the server apparatus as a reply. (see column 8 line 50-55) The server apparatus further comprises: means (column 3 line 5-17) for transmitting specifying data of the second fixed form reply to the client apparatus; means (collator of fig. 13, abstract) for receiving the second reply or specifying data of the first reply transmitted from the client apparatus as a reply in the communication control means; and totaling means (adding, column 4, lines 25-27, of the reply data is equivalent to the teaching of using a totaling means in Peter's system because the function of a totaling mean is to add, and Peter would need a totaling means for performing the addition) for totaling a number of the selections of each reply as the reply to the message based on the specifying data, and storing the results of the totalization of each reply to the message in relation the specifying data. (graphic plot with added and manipulated data, column 4 line 25-27). The client apparatus further comprises: means for receiving (see processing apparatus of column 12 line 10) the specifying data of the second fixed form reply sent from the server apparatus in the receiving control means, (abstract) and means (see display of 7 of fig. 1, and processing apparatus of column 12 line 10) for outputting the stored second fixed form reply based on the specifying data in the output means.

Regarding claims 15 and 16: Peter teaches wherein the client apparatus comprises means for accepting an input of a free form reply (response) to the message, in a control means (see column 8 line 51-52, and fig. 6), and the server apparatus comprises free form reply managing means for managing the free form reply (see 102 and collator of fig. 13) in relation to data for

Art Unit: 2624

specifying the reply message (column 8 line 60-68) transmitted from the client, in the server by loading the data base with replies, such that the replies are all conveniently presented in the database. (See column 8 line 54-59, and column 4 line 24-27).

Regarding claims 17-20: Peter teaches a recording medium (column 10 line 11) readable by a computer to control the system of claims 1-4. Please see discussion on claims 1-4.

Regarding claims 21: Peter et al teaches a message system to process (manage) electronic message and reply (see abstract) comprising: a reply data storage device storing a plurality of fixed form replies set (see bulletin board and column 3 line 1-13); a controller (the control of the computer used as a bulletin board e.g. # 1 of fig. 1) for receiving a message (yes, of column 4, lines 30-50) from a host (2, fig. 1, abstract) and allowing a user to select a reply from the selected fix form reply set (see column 4, lines 35-40) stored in the reply data storage device, the fixed form reply set independent of the message, (e.g. fig. 8); and an output device (the control controlling transmitting of data, column 8, line 53) outputting the selected reply to the host. (See column 8 line 53, abstract).

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column

Art Unit: 2624

1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

Regarding claim 22: Peter teaches that the selection of a fixed form reply set is based on a category (yes or no to "do you like chocolate", column 4, lines 30-50) of the message.

Regarding claim 24: Peter teaches wherein the host receives a plurality of the outputted selected fixed form replies and displays a bar graph illustrating a frequency of responses. (See column 4, lines 24-27, fig, 12, column 20, lines 40-67, column 21, lines 1-10)

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 25: Peter teaches a computer readable storage medium storing a computer program (column 10 line 1-35) instructing computers to perform: storing a plurality of fixed form replies set (see bulletin board and column 3, line 1-13), each fixed form reply set containing a plurality of replies; (fig. 6) storing the message; (see bulletin board and column 3 line 1-13, yes of the question "do you like chocolate", column 4, lines 30-45); receiving the message (column 4, lines 30-50) from a host; (2, fig. 1, abstract) selecting a reply from the selected fixed form reply set (yes, or no, column 4, lines 25-50) independent of the message, (e.g. fig. 8); allowing a user to choose a reply from the selected fixed form reply set; (column 4, lines 25-50); sending the chosen reply to the host (column 8, lines 53).

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column 1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

Art Unit: 2624

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

5. Claims 5, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters and Pinter as applied to claims 1, and 21 above and further in view of Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent # 5982891).

Regarding claims 5, 23: Peter teaches to select a text and still picture as free form reply. (Fig. 6)

Peter in view of Pinter do not teach to select speech, sound, and moving pictures as free form reply.

Ginter et al. teach that usage information used in a survey (see column 36 line 30-40) transmitted from one party to another can be selected from speech, sound, and moving pictures. (See column 58, line 55-65).

Art Unit: 2624

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Peter in view of Pinter: by selecting the free form reply to be represented in forms of speech, sound, and moving pictures.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Peter in view of Pinter by the teaching of Ginter et al. because of the following reasons: (a) selecting electronic information to be represented in forms of speech, sound, and moving pictures would have allowed the information being easily understood by a user and would be helpful for the user in making the reply.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/26/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Peter does not teach store questions and answers separately and Pinter does not suggest the data for a reply independent of the message has been considered.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Art Unit: 2624

Peter teaches an electronic news system (fig. 13) managing electronic messages (see the question of options that best describes a vehicle of fig. 6) and a reply, (see fig. 6 and see abstract) to the message comprising: output means (the program that controls the transmitting of survey document, column 8, lines 35-45) for outputting the message with the data for a reply to the message (survey document e.g. fig. 8), the data for a reply independent of the message; (e.g. fig. 8).

Peter does not specifically disclose that the message and the reply data are stored separately.

However, Pinter, in the same area of managing an electronic message and a reply to the message, (abstract, column 1, lines 40-65, column 2, lines 1-35) teaches to store a reply data (response options, column 2, lines 34) separately from a message (canned messages, column 2, lines 14, column 1, lines 40-50; the canned messages are stored in a canned message file, column 1, lines 50-67, and the response options are stored in a multiple response options file, column 2, lines 23-27, column 5, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the electronic system of Peter by: storing the reply data separately from the message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Peter by the teaching of Pinter because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to retrieve and display the message and question quickly, and would

Art Unit: 2624

have been helpful for the user, (b) it would have allowed the system being easily maintained and altered, (c) it would have provided an improved electronic message system, as taught by Pinter, at column 1, lines 35-40, and (d) storing the "reply data" and the "message" separately provides the advantages of keeping easy inventory of the reply to each message and allowed the user(s) to keep track of each reply and each message in a separate file. Thereby, the reply and the message can be easily managed and accessible to the user(s).

7. ACTION IS FINAL

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTHS shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892 or to Supervisor Mr. David Moore whose phone number is (703) 308-7452.

Gabriel Garcia

**GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

May 8, 2002